

# CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

VOL. 2.

"YE SHALL KNOW THE TRUTH, AND THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—JESUS CHRIST.

NO. 31.

[ \$1 50 in advance. ]

PROVIDENCE, R. I. SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1826.

[ \$2 at the end of the year. ]

## CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY,

By BARZILLAI CRANSTON,

At No. 8, North Main-Street (3d story) near the Market-House.

Rev. DAVID PICKERING, Editor.

### REPLY TO THE INQUIRIES OF "L. G."

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 118.)

To give support to the doctrine of a general judgment in the future state of being, our correspondent has quoted Heb. ix. 27. "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment."

It ought to be the sole object of every inquirer, and of every writer on sacred subjects, to ascertain, if possible, what instruction the inspired penmen intended to communicate, in all those dark and difficult parts of their writings, which the mind is not likely to comprehend at the first reading. To secure this object, or to render success probable, it is necessary to appeal to the scriptures with prayerful minds, and carefully compare those difficult parts with their connexions. If there be nothing in the connexion which authorizes the conclusion that the subject of discourse is *changed*, it would be doing violence to the divine testimony to give such an interpretation to one part, as would destroy its connexion with the other. This reasoning will apply with all the force of demonstration, (at least, in our minds,) to the popular interpretation of the passage before us, by which it has been applied to a general judgment of all mankind, at the dissolution of the material universe. Let us now appeal to the passage, with the connexion in which it stands, to see whether the interpretation we have mentioned be there authorized.

To render our inquiries the more successful, we should begin with the viith chapter, and we shall find that the apostle was treating the same general subject through the viiith, ixth and to the 22d verse of the xth chapter, without any intermission, or the introduction of a different topic.

The burden of the apostle's reasoning, in these chapters, is to show the superiority of the Priesthood of Christ, over that of Aaron and his sons. He brings to view the office of Melchisedec, who was *anointed of God*, to be a priest; and tells us that Christ was not made a Priest after the order of Aaron, and his sons, who were anointed by men, but after the more perfect manner of Melchisedec, who received his anointing directly from the Most High. But comparing the Priesthood of Christ, with that of Aaron and his sons, the former appears vastly superior, inasmuch that the one is considered no more than the faint emblem of the other. "The law," therefore, with all its sacrifices, "was a shadow of good things to come; but not the very image of the things;" that is, not an entire and perfect resemblance of the gospel, its High Priest and his offering, but a faint

and imperfect representation of the new and better Covenant. In both the legal and christian Covenants, "the shedding of blood" was required, otherwise the offering, through which the people were to be accepted, could not be presented by the High Priest: And as the Priest under the law had not the power of rising from the dead, he could not enter into the *holy place* to present the sacrifice, if he were himself to become the victim: Hence it was necessary that a substitute should be found, in which the high priest might be symbolically represented as slain. Here we discover one essential point in which the resemblance was not a perfect one: For in Christ, we find both the sacrifice and the High Priest. Having noted these particulars, we may begin with the 22d verse and proceed with some remarks to the end of the chapter.

"And almost all things are by the law purged with blood: and without shedding of blood is no remission. *It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; that is, with the blood of slain beasts,*"—but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, *which are the figures of the true*; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others.—For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself: And as it is appointed unto men *under the law*, "once to die," *by a symbolical representation in the victim that was slain*, "and after this the judgment;" Which denotes that the high priest entered into the symbolical presence of "the Judge of all the earth," where judgment was rendered in favour of the whole congregation for whom the offering was presented—"So," that is in like manner, "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many;" that is, of all mankind; *for he is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world*; "and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

Whoever will carefully examine the connexion, and read to the 22d verse of chap. x, will see that the resemblance is kept in view between the legal and christian dispensations; the priesthood of Aaron, and the priesthood of Christ: And that by the explanation which we have given, the correspondence is perfectly preserved: Whereas, by the popular application of this text, all the confusion of contrarieties is at once introduced.

The text asserts, that "as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many;" &c. But where is there any possible resemblance between a *future general judgment*, and Christ's dy-

ing for the sins of the whole world? And more especially, when we are informed that his death was for the express purpose of 'putting away sin by the sacrifice of himself?' Would the popular sentiment of a future judgment and endless condemnation bear the least resemblance to the Saviour's dying to *put away sin, or make an end of transgression*?—Let this subject be seriously examined, and the following observations, we think, will appear consistent.

1. The high priest under the law entered once a year, with the blood of the sacrifice, into the holy place, (a figure of heaven,) where he was accepted and found pardon extended, by the Judge of all the earth, to all those for whom he offered a sacrifice, which was the whole multitude of the house of Israel: Consequently, all were called to the delightful exercise of rejoicing and praise.

2. Christ, after a similar manner, though in a more perfect and extensive sense, made an offering of himself. This offering was for all mankind: And by it, as we are told in scripture, he "obtained eternal redemption for us." His acceptance, therefore, is not to be called in question. Now if Christ were accepted in his offering, and which cannot be denied, it follows of necessity, that all those for whom he *gave his life a ransom* were accepted in him.

It may now be asked, if all were accepted in him, and through the offering which he presented, why are not all mankind virtuous and happy? We answer,—because all do not believe this truth.

Suppose a part of the Israelites, for whom the high priest offered a sacrifice, did not believe that they were accepted in his offering; and that the pardoning love of God was not extended to them, notwithstanding the golden bells attached to the high priest's garment were heard by the whole multitude who were waiting without.—Suppose ye that they could join in the shouts of rejoicing, and the sentiments of thanksgiving?—Neither can those who *discredit* the glorious message of "peace through the blood of the cross," join in the ennobling sentiments of gratitude for that *unspeakable gift*. In both cases, *unbelief* would be sure to render them hopeless; and in some instances, the victims of despair.

As our correspondent has adverted to two more passages; to wit—Heb. x. 26, 27, and Revelation xxii. 11, they must be reserved for future numbers.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

FOR THE CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

### THE RAINBOW.

Behold the bright—the beauteous bow!  
Set in the heav'ns by God's own hand:  
When its resplendent tints we view,  
Enraptur'd, we admiring stand.  
In ev'ry diff'rent hue, we see  
An emblem of some grace divine,  
And in the whole a type of thee,  
Dear Saviour of the world, doth shine.

We God's bright bow, set in the cloud,  
As token of his cov'nant bless;  
That he'll no more destroy by flood;  
Although frail man his laws transgress.  
And when the glorious arch appears,  
Tho' darkest clouds obscure the sky;  
The promis'd sign dispels our fears,  
Our hearts with hope—with love, beat high.  
So Christ is seen, the hope of all,  
Array'd in heav'nly diadem;  
Each grace adorns his coronal,  
But mercy shines its brightest gem.  
'Twas mercy pierc'd the clouds of sin,  
That darken'd all this vale of tears;  
Gentiles and Jews to God 'twill bring;  
'Tis mercy Jesus' name endears.  
He sits in heav'n, a token clear,  
That erring souls may not despair;  
For he's their head—their pioneer,  
His members all must meet him there.  
Then, when the floods of sin arise  
And clouds o'erspread our mental sky;  
We'll look to Jesus in the skies,  
And trust that our salvation's nigh.

ELLEN.

## SELECTIONS.

FROM THE (BOSTON) RECORDER AND TELEGRAPH.  
UNIVERSALISM DISPROVED,  
BY A NEW PROCESS OF REASONING.

*"Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon."*—ISA. LV. 7.

It is evident from this passage, and from hundreds of others to be found in the Bible, that God will bestow pardon upon the truly penitent. This is the truth (and it is one which I presume no denomination of Christians has ever pretended to call in question) on which I shall chiefly rely, in disproving the doctrine of Universal Salvation.

It is well known to those, who have had much acquaintance with the believers in this doctrine, that there is a great diversity in their religious sentiments. They all agree, to be sure, in the general conclusion, that the whole human race will finally be saved; but in their modes of arriving at this conclusion, they differ variously and widely. It is my intention to disprove their several schemes, by comparing them with the universally acknowledged truth, that God will bestow pardon upon the truly penitent.

Some have supposed that there is *no sin* in the world, or in the universe. "Every man," say they, "answers the particular end for which he was made. Every man accomplishes the work, which it was intended he should accomplish. One man performs the will of God as much as another. Whatever is, is right—morally right." The conclusion is, therefore, that *all men will be saved*—But if there is no sin in the world, why does God propose pardon to the penitent? Do not pardon, and penitence necessarily imply crime and guilt? Who ever was pardoned, that had committed no offence? The fact, that God proposes pardon to the penitent, is proof conclusive that men are *sinners*; that they have violated, not indeed his general purposes, but his *laws*; and that the scheme of universal salvation, which is founded on the supposition that there is no sin in the world, is wholly a delusion.

Some have supposed that all men are sinners; but that every sin brings its own punishment directly along with it. Every one suffers as much as he deserves, in the adversities and ills of the present life;

so that when the sufferings of the present life are past, all suffering is ended. There is nothing to be feared beyond the grave.—But God, we have seen, proposes *pardon* to the penitent. Pardon implies, not only crime and guilt, but exposure to punishment. The very act of bestowing pardon, is the act of freeing the person receiving it from his liability to suffer deserved punishment. Such is the nature of this act, both as it occurs among men, and as spoken of in the word of God. What then is the proper punishment of sin? What is the punishment to which all sinners are liable previous to pardon, and from which pardon frees those who repent? Is it indeed the *adversities and ills* of the present life? But who are free from these? And, on this ground, who are pardoned? And, as God promises pardon to those who repent, who are the penitent? Where are the favoured few, who are to suffer no more sickness, no more disappointments or troubles, so long as they live? If the troubles of this life constitute the proper punishment of sin, manifestly none either are, or ever were, or ever will be, *pardoned*. And unless the promises of God are broken, none ever were, or will be penitent. To such absurdities are we driven, by supposing sin to bring all its deserved punishment with it, in the present life.

Some have considered *temporal death* as the proper punishment of sin. They suppose this was the death threatened to our first parents in Paradise; and that this constitutes the penalty of the divine law. And when it is said in the Scriptures, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." "The wages of sin is death," &c. they understand this of *temporal death*. Consequently they infer, that when temporal death is suffered, all is suffered. There is nothing to be endured or feared beyond it. But how will this sentiment compare with the divine promises of *pardon* to the penitent? If temporal death is the proper punishment of sin, who are the pardoned? Who are the penitent? Who are, or ever were, or ever will be, exempt from their liability to suffer temporal death? We are driven, therefore, to the same absurdity as before. We must see and say, either that temporal death is not the proper deserved punishment of sin, or that penitence and pardon are unknown in the religious concerns of men.

Some have believed that mankind are sinners, but that Christ has suffered the penalty of the law, and cancelled all the demands of justice, in their stead. Consequently the law, they say, is satisfied; justice has no more claims, and all of every character are sure of heaven. But if this sentiment be true, what mean the frequent proposals of *pardon*, which God has made, and is making, to the penitent? If Christ has suffered the full penalty of the law, in the place of men, for what do they stand in need of pardon? Pardon frees those who receive it from deserved punishment. But if all the punishment of sinners has been suffered already, in Christ their substitute, then they cannot be freed from farther deserved punishment. In other words, they cannot on this ground, be pardoned. There is no room for pardon. It is as true, therefore, as it is that God proposes pardon to the penitent, that Christ did not suffer the penalty of the law for men, and that neither all men, nor any, can on this ground be saved. Christ suffered enough to magnify the broken law and make it honorable—to manifest to the full the divine displeasure at sin—to answer all those purposes in the divine government, which could have been answered by inflicting deserved punishment upon our guilty race; but he did not suffer the penalty of the law, or cancel the debt of justice, for any man living.

It is the opinion of many, that mankind are sinners, and must repent, and that *all will finally be brought to repentance*. Those who do not repent in this life, or in death, will be punished hereafter till they do repent. And that degree of punishment which is necessary in order to bring them to repentance, and thus prepare them for happiness, is the proper punishment of their sins. But God proposes *pardon* to the penitent; or, in other words, he proposes to ex-

empt those who repent, from their liability to suffer the due reward of their deeds. But on the supposition before us, persons suffer the due reward of their deeds, *previous* to repentance. The proper punishment of their sins, is that degree of punishment which is requisite in order to *bring* them to repentance. They suffer all they deserve, *before* they repent. How then can they be pardoned *after* they repent? For what do they stand in need of pardon? They have nothing more to suffer. They have received already the proper punishment of their sins. These remarks render it plain, that we must either renounce the promises of pardon to the penitent, or we must renounce the idea, that the proper punishment of sin is that degree of punishment which is necessary in order to bring sinners to repentance.

It has been asserted, as a ground of universal salvation, that the *contrary* is not so much as intimated in the Scriptures. "The idea of future punishment never once entered the minds of the sacred writers; nor have they used a single expression, which is fitted to convey this idea to others. The supposition of future punishment is therefore wholly gratuitous." But the Scriptures, it will not be doubted, contain offers of *pardon* to the penitent. In other words, they promise, on condition of repentance, *exemption* from some deserved punishment. What then is this punishment? If it is not future punishment, it must be present, temporal punishment. But from what present, temporal punishment, are the penitent exempt, more than the impenitent? Both drink alike, here on earth, of the cup of sorrow. Both share alike the disappointments, and troubles, and ills of life. Both fall alike, by one means or another, before the stroke of the "king of terrors." So far as temporal things are concerned, "all things come alike to all"—there is one event to the righteous, and to the wicked." If then there is no such thing as future punishment, who are the pardoned? And where, on this ground, is the mighty difference in point of circumstances, between those who repent, and those who remain impenitent?

It will be obvious, I think, without pursuing this train of remark further, that the principle assumed at the commencement of this discussion, contains within itself a perfect refutation of nearly all the schemes of universal salvation which have ever been devised.—Only let a person admit (what I suppose no one who believes the Bible is unwilling to admit) that *God will bestow pardon upon the truly penitent*—let him follow this single truth out, and be consistent—and he cannot be a Universalist. He cannot stop short of believing, that the proper punishment of sin—that to which we are all liable previous to pardon, and from which pardon frees us,—is *eternal punishment*.

It appears from what has been said, that there are several sorts of Universalists. Among those thus denominated, there is a great diversity of religious sentiment. They are agreed, to be sure, in the general conclusion, that the human family are all to be saved; but they come to this conclusion by very different, and in some cases, by totally *opposite* routes. Their various modes of arriving at it involve systems of religious belief, the most diverse and irreconcilable. One, for instance, builds his Universalism upon the principle, that there is *no sin* in the world; while another builds his upon the opposite principle, that we are *great sinners*, but that Christ has paid the whole debt, and set us free. One tells us that there is no such thing as future punishment; while another asserts, that the wicked will be punished in the other world, until they are brought to repentance, and thus prepared to be released. Some think, that all will be saved through the merits of Christ; and others, that the interposition of Christ, except as a mere religious teacher, was unnecessary. Yet we hear of no disputing among these different classes of Universalists. They associate together with as much harmony as though they were perfectly united in one mind and judgment. Indeed, it is not uncommon for the same individual to slide from one of these



schemes to another, in the course of a few days, and even in the course of a single conversation, as though the distance between them was unperceived, and of no account. From facts like these, it is not, I think, uncandid to conclude, that with most Universalists the great object is, not so much to discover truth, as to support a favorite point. The general conclusion is established first; and the means of arriving at it are regarded as of minor importance. The point is fixed at once that *all must be saved*; and he who can gain this desired point by the shortest and best method, is entitled of course to the highest praise.—No wonder Universalists are for the most part, uneasy in their minds. The solemn trifling, in which they indulge, is not of a nature to bring rest to the soul. As the sand under their feet is continually giving way, they must continue struggling, or they must sink. But what will they do, when their sandy foundation is all gone—when the season of trifling is for ever past—and when, in the light of another world, despised, dreaded truth is poured in upon their consciences, in one resistless and eternal stream!

P—.

FROM THE UNIVERSALIST MAGAZINE.  
REPLY TO THE FOREGOING.

No doubt some who read this paper may be of opinion that the reasoning contained in the foregoing, and the arguments which the writer depends on as being amply sufficient to overthrow the doctrine of Universal Salvation, are too weak and inconsistent to require or deserve an answer. But such should reflect, that the minds of others may not, even, at this day, have arrived to that salutary degree of discernment which enables those who enjoy it to detect the false reasoning which is so very palpable in this piece of labor, designed to maintain the doctrine of endless punishment. We have no reason to doubt that the author was satisfied, that his arguments were sound; and it is very probable that the editor of the *Recorder and Telescope* was satisfied also that Universalism is refuted, or why should he voluntarily expose what he considered fallacious, when he must know it would operate against the cause in which he is engaged? Nor is it at all likely that the author and the editor are the only persons in community, who are incapable of discerning, without assistance, the unsoundness of the arguments which they have presented to the public; many of their readers no doubt feel as much assured as they do, that the arguments of this author are unanswerable. In fact it has been stated that some have expressed their conviction that this piece is a fair refutation of Universalism.

It is presumed that the candid will acknowledge that the foregoing considerations form a sufficient apology for an attempt to show this advocate of endless punishment, and others, who allow his reasoning, wherein his arguments are incorrect, and the ground he has taken untenable.

This writer professes to be acquainted with the various views which Universalists entertain, and therefore attempts to overthrow the whole by showing that the text, on which he relies, is directly opposed to all and every system on which the belief of Universal Salvation is predicated.

The first scheme of Universal Salvation, which this writer overthrows, is established on the hypothesis, that there is no sin in the world, that whatever is, is *morally* right. There is good reason to believe, that this statement was the effect of a want of information. The writer of this reply, though much conversant with Universalists for more than thirty years, has never found any author who built his belief of the doctrine on this hypothesis. It is true this writer has connected another idea with this hypothesis, which many Universalists as well as Calvinists fully believe, viz. That "every man answers the particular end for which he was made, &c." All predestinarians believe this, the Orthodox as much as Universalists; but neither of them contends that there is no moral wrong in the world.

The next scheme of doctrine, which this writer attempts to disprove, by the fact that God proposes to pardon the penitent, supposes "that all men are sinners; but that every sin brings its own punishment directly along with it, &c." In order to show that this scheme is not correct, this writer was under the necessity of informing his readers that pardon necessarily frees "the person who receives it from his liability to suffer deserved punishment."—Here the reader is requested to make a pause, and carefully cast in mind the question, whether this statement be correct. This advocate of endless punishment was evidently sensible that his argument depended entirely on this, his exposition of the word *pardon*. But this being the case, is it not worthy of remark, that he should give this exposition no other support than barely his own assertion? Is this whole subject, after all the importance which has been attached to it, not worth one quotation? Surprising! It is really mortifying to meet with such attacks.—Our antagonist comes forward with as high pretensions and as great seeming confidence as did Peter the hermit, who undertook a crusade to deliver Jerusalem and the holy sepulchre from the hands of infidels, and informs the public that he is going to prostrate the whole phalanx of Universalists "by a new process of reasoning;" but the moment he comes to a point on which he knows his all depends, he gives it the weight of his own assertion, and that is all!

It is by no means improper to inform this writer that he is quite in a mistake to call his process of reasoning a new one. Bold and unsupported assertions are no new things. They have been in use as long as error has been supported.

That this exposition of *pardon*, on which our writer depends to disprove Universal Salvation, is contrary to scripture, is fully proved by a multitude of passages, of which the following are a sample: Rom. ii. 6. "Who will render to every man according to his deeds."—Col. iii. 25. "But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done; and there is no respect of persons." These passages, with many others of the same import, clearly maintain what St. Paul gives us to understand in the following passage. Heb. ii. 2, 3. "For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?" The plain sense of this last passage is, that every transgression and disobedience, committed under the law dispensation, did, under that dispensation, receive a just recompense of reward; and that being a matter of fact, it is impossible that any can escape under the dispensation of the gospel. What think you now, reader, of this writer's exposition of *pardon*? If what the scriptures assert is true, and this writer's assertion be true also, every one must see, that God never did nor ever will pardon a single soul who has sinned! But the Scriptures as fully maintain the doctrine of pardon or forgiveness as they maintain the doctrine of positive, universal and impartial retribution. See Col. ii. 13. "And you, being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses." Here we learn that those Colossians, who had been dead in sin, had obtained forgiveness of all their trespasses. Let this fact, reader, lie in your understanding by the side of the fact which has been fully proved, that God renders to every one according to his works, and then you will see that this writer's exposition of pardon is directly opposed to the testimony of divine inspiration.

The unhappy fact, respecting our opponent, is this; he is too little acquainted with the scriptures, and too much under the influence of popular prejudices to reason correctly on the subject in which he has engaged. If his acquaintance with the scriptures had been such as would have justified his undertaking, he could not have written his exposition of pardon, without bringing to his recollection that

beautiful passage recorded in Isaiah xl. 2. "Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins." What fact does this passage state in support of the assertion that the iniquity of Jerusalem was pardoned? Answer, the fact that she had already received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins.

Having now entirely removed the very foundation on which our opposer rested his whole argument, it seems unnecessary to labour to show that each particular part of his superstructure is also removed.—Having a clear understanding of the fact, that the sinner, who is forgiven or pardoned is also duly recompensed according to all his offences, the whole argument of our opponent is clearly refuted; and his text shown to have no force in a single point of argument, to which he has applied it. And yet if his exposition of *pardon* were allowed, his main argument would not thereby find support; for as Jesus was exalted to give repentance as well as the remission of sins, it is just as easy for him to give repentance to all men as to any. And this writer will do well to consider, that it is sin which obtains remission, not deserved punishment.

Perhaps there is one sense, in which the "process," by which this writer has attempted to disprove Universalism, may be considered *new*. He contends that the fact that God proposes to pardon the penitent proves that all men cannot be saved. Very well; let this, for the sake of the argument, be granted; and then we will ask, what he would have contended for, relative to this subject, if in place of proposing to pardon the penitent, God had given us positive information, that he would not pardon the penitent? Would this writer be willing to allow, that if God would not pardon the penitent, then all men would be saved? No, surely he would not; for he contends that without pardon the sinner cannot be saved. What does the whole amount to? Answer, this writer has found a proposition, which maintains exactly the same thing, which the opposite of itself maintains! This is new! St. Peter says, "God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come unto repentance." But how does this writer's argument reply to this passage? If all should come to repentance, then all would be forgiven; but all could not be saved, because God proposes to pardon the penitent! St. Paul says, God "will have all men to be saved." But this writer contends that this cannot be done, because God proposes to pardon the penitent! God says, by Isaiah, "Look unto me and be saved, all the ends of the earth, for I am God, and there is none else." But this writer shows that this cannot be, because God proposes to pardon the penitent! Well, could all be saved if God would not pardon the penitent? No, and therefore this process, to disprove Universal Salvation, is *new*!

All which this writer has said respecting other various views of salvation, entertained by Universalists, such as that temporal death being the penalty of the law, there can be no punishment beyond it; or that Christ having suffered the penalty in our room and stead, we shall all be saved thereby; or that though the sinner may be punished in the future state, that punishment will finally effect his repentance and salvation, need not here be particularly noticed, because if his exposition of pardon is clearly disproved, then his text is shown not to apply to his subject in any case. It seems proper, however, to remind him, that he has, himself, overthrown his own scheme.—See his statement which follows: "Christ suffered enough to magnify the broken law and make in honorable to manifest to the full the divine displeasure at sin—to answer all those purposes in the divine government, which could have been answered by inflicting deserved punishment upon our guilty race." If we allow this statement, can any thing be more evident, than that the infliction of eternal punishment can answer no purpose in the divine govern-

ment? He says, that "Christ suffered enough to answer all the purposes in the divine government, which could have been answered by inflicting deserved punishment upon our guilty race."—Then, surely, to inflict deserved punishment upon our guilty race, can answer no purpose in the divine government. Thus he prostrates all which he has, with great care, and with the assistance of his "new process," endeavored to set up.

Nothing need be said in reply to this writer's suggestions, that Universalists are uneasy in their minds, and that they fly, from one scheme to another, to maintain their doctrine. All this is done for the want of sound argument, and only proves that he would be willing to asperse whom he cannot convince.

Some acknowledgment may be due for the favorable commendation, which this advocate of endless misery bestows on Universalists of various systems, though it seems to be handed out rather in form of accusation. He allows that we all go on in harmony one with another, notwithstanding our views are so different.—This we accept as a commendation, and hope we may be able to justify the representation by our future conduct. It is true that Universalists have various views respecting the ways and means and times, which, in the councils of heaven, regard the final happiness of all mankind; but we feel so entirely confident that God's ways, means and times are all established in infinite wisdom, and that our different views can never change any of them, that we think it far more reasonable and more consistent with the spirit of Christ, to unite in charity and rejoice together in that great truth in which we all agree, than to embitter our christian race with discord and mutual recriminations.

Suppose a whole family is on a journey, from New-England to the western country, where the provident father has vested a large sum in landed estate, where he purposes to settle for the remainder of his life. He has provided comfortable means and eligible accommodations for his whole family on their journey, and their prospects justify every rational gratification of hope. But among the children, who are ignorant of the country whither they are bound, and of the distance they must travel to reach it, some difference of conjecture arises. One thinks it will require six months to perform the journey, another is fully persuaded that they shall all be safe at their home in three months; there are also different opinions among them respecting the country through which they are to pass. Some have formed a notion that they must encounter a very rough and fatiguing way,—others think the road is more smooth and comfortable; but they all agree that in due time, having passed all which is necessary, they shall arrive at their destined, happy home. Would it not be unwise for these children to indulge a bitter spirit towards each other on account of these various notions? Would it not be the very height of folly and even perverseness, for these children to refuse to travel together, to eat and drink together on their journey, because they entertained these different opinions? Let the children be quiet and love one another, and trust all their concerns to the wisdom and providence of the parent, who impartially regards them, and who will bear them company, and bring them safely home.

H. B.

FROM THE GREENVILLE GAZETTE.

## TOLERATION—AGAIN.

We deem the following worthy of publication, as it will show the light in which Judge Hallowell's intolerance is contemplated.

Messrs. Editors,—I observed in your paper of the 10th inst. that, "in a case tried before Judge Hallowell and a special Jury, in the District Court of Philadelphia, Nov. 14, a man was offered as a witness for the defendant, who, on being interrogated by the

plaintiff's counsel as to his religious belief, declared that he did not believe in a future state of rewards and punishments, *after this life*; but that the only punishment for sin was in the *present state of existence*. The Judge, after argument, refused to admit him to be qualified as a witness." Whether there be an object to be answered in giving publicity to this proceeding of one of our courts of Justice, or not, its publication in the Newspapers will have its effect upon the public mind. You will, therefore, as I trust, permit a few words to be said on this remarkable procedure. It does not appear, by the statement of the case in your paper, whether the man who was offered as a witness was a man of good moral character or not; but, as nothing is said against him on this score it is to be presumed his character was good; for had it not been so, that would undoubtedly have been preferred as the ground of objection. Of course we are to suppose that a man of good moral character is refused permission, in a court of Justice, and in a country whose constitution of government forbids religious tests, to sustain the standing which all but notorious liars enjoy, because he honestly believes that punishment, or the consequences of sin, are confined to this mortal state, where, alone, for aught that reason or revelation say to the contrary, sin, the cause, does or can exist! It is not in my power to believe that his honour, Judge Hallowell, is actuated either by the principles of the christian religion, or those of our free and equitable constitution of government. Faith is not a voluntary act of the mind, but the necessary result of convincing evidence. Therefore, if a man is to be thus indirectly stigmatized in a court of Justice, as unworthy of credit, either with or without an oath, for his unavoidable religious belief, it is manifest that a spirit of intolerance and oppression reigns, which is in the highest degree dangerous to our freedom.

How many thousands of people there are, in our country, whose moral sense is so weak, and whose regard to the good opinion of men is so strong, that, rather than bear the odium of being refused the privilege of testifying in such a case, would lie to the *Holy Spirit*, and pretend to believe what they *did* not! In that case thousands of the most presumptuous and daring of all liars would be indulged a privilege which an honest man is denied! "*On this great principle (according to Judge Hallowell) rests all our institutions, and especially the distribution of Justice between man and man!*" Who knows but what the defendant, in the case stated, failed to sustain a just cause, by the rejection of this witness? And what a safe, grand and glorious principle our institutions rest upon, when a man is liable to lose an important cause, in a court of Justice, because a material witness may not happen to believe in eternal future torments, or the papal notion of limited purgatorial fire!

If such a proceeding be not a stepstone to inquisitorial abomination, the name of your humble servant is not what he thinks it is. Reverse the case, and let an unbeliever in future punishment act the part which Judge Hallowell has; let him say that a believer in future punishment shall not be allowed to testify in a court of Justice, though an honest man and of good report, and how would his conduct be

approved! Such an one might say, the believer in future punishment cannot feel the obligation of an oath, because he believe, that, though he should commit perjury, yet if he should repent, even but one moment before death, he shall escape with impunity; which certainly would be a more reasonable plea than that a man should not feel responsible who has no idea of avoiding just punishment, in this life, for such an act.

But who would not deprecate such a system of recrimination! Where will be our liberty, where our equality, where our security in the impartial administration of Justice, when such a system of proscription shall be adopted! I devoutly wish, Messrs. Editors, that the case in question may be published throughout our country, and that the conduct of Judge Hallowell may be viewed in its true light.

AMERICUS.

To provoke a person whom you would convince, not only rouses his anger, and sets it against your doctrine, but it directs its resentment against your person, as well as against all your instructions and arguments. You must treat an opponent like a friend, if you would persuade him to learn any thing from you.

## MARRIED,

In this town, on Thursday evening, by Rev. Mr. Pickering, Mr. Alvin O. Read, of Pawtucket, to Miss Martha J. Roberts, of this town.

In Yarmouth, Ms. on the 22d ultimo, by Rev. Calvin Monroe, of Chatham, Mr. Ebenezer Taylor, to Miss Temperance Thatcher, both of the former place.

## DIED,

In this town, on Friday week, Mr. Joseph Dominique Costa, aged 57, a native of Italy—but for many years a resident of this town.

Same day, Mr. Albert Humphreys, aged 19 years. On Thursday week, Mrs. Rebecca Cady, wife of Mr. Jonathan Cady, aged 78.

On Saturday last, Fanny, infant daughter of Mr. George P. Parker, of Boston.

On Monday last, Miss Elira Johnson, aged 21 years.

On Wednesday last, Elizabeth Russell, daughter of Mr. Elisha C. Wells, aged 14 months. Funeral this afternoon, at 2 o'clock, from his residence in John-street.

In Gloucester, 26th ult. Mrs. Zerviah Steere, wife of Mr. Enoch Steere, in the 75th year of her age.

## NOTICE.

The members of the First Universalist Society, and also the pew owners in the Chapel, are requested to meet at the vestry on Monday evening next, at 6 o'clock. A general and punctual attendance is requested, as business of importance will be laid before the Society. By order of the trustees.

March 4.

SAMUEL YOUNG, Clerk

\*A few copies of the 3d edition of Mr. Pickering's answer to the Quaker is received, and for sale at S. W. Wheeler's store, 110½ Westminster street. Also Rev. Mr. Kneeland's Sermon on the doctrine of ATONEMENT. Also, Kneeland's Testament.

## JOB PRINTING

☞ Neatly executed at this Office, at short notice, and on favourable terms. Justices' Blanks for sale.